

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Accordingly, 1-13 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art of Figure 11 in view of Warneke et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a high-frequency circuit board unit having a semiconductor device which includes “a high-frequency terminal for sending and receiving a high-frequency signal to and from said terminal electrode of said circuit board and a non-high-frequency signal terminal through which said high-frequency signal is not sent or received.

Among the limitations of independent claim 10 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a manufacturing method for a high-frequency circuit board which includes “mounting a semiconductor device including a high-frequency signal terminal and a non-high-frequency signal terminal on said circuit board in such a manner that said high-frequency signal terminal is connected to the other terminal of said passive impedance circuit device and said non-high-frequency signal terminal does not send or receive a high-frequency signal.”

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 10 can be found in the present specification at page 8, lines 10 through 16.

As admitted on page 2 of the Office Action, the admitted prior art of Fig. 11 neither discloses nor suggests that at least one terminal electrode of the circuit board and the

high-frequency signal terminal of the semiconductor device is connected to the ground electrode of the circuit board for conducting direct current.

Warneke et al. does not remedy any of the deficiencies of the prior art of Fig. 11. If one were to substitute the filter of Warneke et al. for the filter 15 shown in prior art Fig. 11 of the present application, a high-frequency signal would still be capable of damaging the semiconductor device through the terminal electrode 5a because there is no suggestion in the teachings of these references to change the connecting land 8b of Fig. 11 into a non-high-frequency signal terminal as required by independent claims 1 and 10. In fact, inasmuch as the combination of the admitted prior art of Fig. 11 and Warneke et al. teach that a high-frequency signal terminal could damage the semiconductor device through the terminal electrode 5a, the combination suggested in the Office Action teaches away from the present invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Claims 2-9 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Claims 11-13 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 10 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-9 and 11-13 are likewise patentable.

Application No.: 09/974,668

Docket No.: M1071.1451/P1451

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1 and 10, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-13 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: September 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant